

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 3-36 remain pending. Claims 1 and 3-36 have been rejected.

Claims 1, 23, 35 and 36 have been amended. No claims have been canceled. No claims have been added. Support for the amendments is found in the specification, the drawings, and in the claims as originally filed. Applicants submit that the amendments do not add new matter.

### **Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 1, 3, 8-11, 13-15, 18 and 19 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,704,879 to Parrish (“Parrish”), in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,785,829 to George, et al. (“George”).

Applicants have amended claim 1 to include adjusting of a first clock, wherein the first clock includes a video clock for a display.

Parrish discloses a computer system 100 that includes a graphics adapter 110 (Figure 1). More specifically, Parrish discloses that graphics adapter 110 consists of bus interface 111, graphics controller 112, graphics BIOS 114, RAM 116, register 115, and oscillator 118. In particular, Parrish discloses that oscillator 118 sends clock pulses to controller 118 to control the frequency of the graphics operations (col. 2, lines 4-11, Figure 1). Further, Parrish discloses that in response to the change in power supply, the frequency of oscillator 118 is modified. Oscillator 118 is capable of generating clock pulses at several different frequencies.

Thus, Parrish merely discloses modifying clock pulses that are sent to the graphics controller. In contrast, amended claim 1 refers to adjusting a first clock, wherein the first clock includes a video clock for a display.

George discloses adjusting operating frequency and supply voltage in sections of a processor 300 (Figure 3). More specifically, George discloses processor 300 includes a graphics

controller 367. In particular, George discloses that clock signals having variable frequencies are sent from clocking circuit 369 to graphics controller 367 (col. 5, lines 64-66). Thus, George, similarly to Parrish fails to disclose adjusting a first clock, wherein the first clock includes a video clock for a display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Parrish, George, nor a combination thereof, discloses adjusting a first clock, wherein the first clock includes a video clock for a display, as recited in amended claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George.

Because claims 3-14 depend from amended claim 1, and add additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 3-14 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George.

With respect to claim 15, the Examiner stated that “As per claim 15 is written in means plus function and contained the same limitations as claims 1 and 3, therefore same rejection is applied”.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Claim 15 includes the following limitations: receiving an indication of power reduction in the graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies.

Parrish discloses that when the power state of computer system 100 changes, AC/DC converter 128 generates an interrupt an interrupt handler. More specifically, Parrish discloses that the interrupt handler notifies graphics adapter 110 of the change of the power state The routine is invoked to respond to the change in power supply by modifying the frequency of the oscillator 118 (Figure 1, col. 2, lines 46-65).

Thus, Parrish merely discloses receiving indication of change in the power state of a computer system. In contrast, claim 15 refers to receiving an indication of power reduction in the

graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies.

As set forth above, George merely discloses that clock signals having variable frequencies are sent from clocking circuit 369 to graphics controller 367 (col. 5, lines 64-66), and similarly to Parrish fails to disclose receiving an indication of power reduction in the graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies, as recited in claim 15.

Thus, neither Parrish, George, nor a combination thereof, discloses receiving an indication of power reduction in the graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies, as recited in claim 15.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 15 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George.

Because claims 16-22 depend from claim 15, and add additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-22 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George.

Claims 4, 5 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parrish in view of George, and U.S. Patent No. 5,349,525 to Dunki-Jacobs, et al. ("Jacobs").

It is respectfully submitted that Parrish does not teach or suggest a combination with George and Jacobs. George does not teach or suggest a combination with Parrish and Jacobs, and Jacobs does not teach or suggest a combination with Parrish and George. Parrish teaches reducing the clock that is sent to the graphics adapter. George, in contrast, teaches reducing the clock of various sections of the processor. Jacobs, in contrast to George and Parrish, teaches an ultrasonic imaging system. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on the Applicants' own disclosure, to combine Parrish, George, and Jacob.

Furthermore, even if Parrish, George and Jacobs were combined, such a combination would lack a graphics controller that has a first clock output that provides an adjustable video clock for a display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Because claims 4, 5, and 12 depend from amended claim 1, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 4, 5, and 12 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Jacobs.

Claims 6, 7, 16 and 17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,704,879 to Parrish (“Parrish”), in view of George and Powell.

It is respectfully submitted that Parrish does not teach or suggest a combination with George and Powell. George does not teach or suggest a combination with Parrish and Powell, and Powell does not teach or suggest a combination with Parrish and George. Parrish teaches reducing the clock that is sent to the graphics adapter. George, in contrast, teaches reducing the clock of various sections of the processor. Powell, in contrast to George and Parrish, teaches reducing brightness of a display. It would be impermissible hindsight, based on the Applicants’ own disclosure, to combine Parrish, George, and Powell.

Furthermore, even if Parrish, George and Powell were combined, such a combination would lack a graphics controller that has a first clock output that provides an adjustable video clock for a display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Furthermore, even if Parrish, George and Powell were combined, such a combination would lack the following limitations of claim 15: receiving an indication of power reduction in the graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies.

Because claims 6, 7, 16 and 17 depend from amended claim 1 and claim 15 respectively, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 6, 7, 16 and 17 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Powell.

Claims 20-22 and 36 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parrish, in view of George and U.S. Patent No. 5,524,249 to Suboh (“Suboh”).

Suboh teaches inactivating pixel clock 52 and reducing frequency of a memory clock 54 generated by phase lock loop 50 that is sent to video controller 24 ( Figure 2, col. 3, line 64-col. 4, line 6), and similarly to George and Parrish, fails to disclose a graphics controller that has a first clock output that provides an adjustable video clock for a display, as recited in amended claim 1.

Thus, neither Parrish, George, Suboh, nor a combination thereof, discloses the discussed limitations of amended claim 1.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that amended claim 1 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Suboh.

Given that amended claim 36 contains related limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 36 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Suboh.

Furthermore, Suboh, similarly to Parrish and George, fails to disclose receiving an indication of power reduction in the graphics controller, wherein the receiving the indication includes receiving a request from the graphics controller for a set of available clock frequencies, as recited in claim 15.

Thus, neither Parrish, George, Suboh, not a combination thereof discloses the discussed limitations of claim 15.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Suboh.

Because claims 20-22 depend from claim15, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20-22 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Suboh.

Claims 23-35 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parrish, in view of George, Powell, Jacobs, and Suboh. Amended claim 23 includes a first clock output that provides an adjustable video clock for a display.

As set forth above, neither Parrish, George, Powell, Jacobs, and Suboh, nor a combination thereof fails to disclose discussed limitations of amended claim 23.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claim 23 is not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Powell, Jacobs, and Suboh.

Given that amended claims 35 and 36 contain related limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that amended claims 35 and 36 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George, and further in view of Powell, Jacobs, and Suboh.

Because claims 24-34 depend from amended claim 23, and add additional limitations, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 24-34 are not obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Parrish in view of George and further in view of Powell, Jacobs, and Suboh.


### CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections and objections have been overcome. If there are any additional charges, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666 for any fee deficiency that may be due.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 6/26/2006

By:   
James C. Scheller  
31,195  
12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025  
(408) 720-8300